



Speech By
Bart Mellish

MEMBER FOR ASPLEY

Record of Proceedings, 12 February 2026

MAJOR SPORTS FACILITIES AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

 **Mr MELLISH** (Aspley—ALP) (4.54 pm): I am happy to follow the committee chair in speaking in this debate. This was a fairly sensible examination of the bill and it was pretty straightforward on what are fairly sensible measures—that was until we saw the late circulated amendments slipped in today, foreshadowed by the Deputy Premier. These are amendments that the Crisafulli LNP government has added on the last day which will essentially add to a legislative schedule that switches off normal planning, heritage and environmental laws in relation to the Brisbane Athlete Village; the Gabba arena; the Wave stages 1, 2 and 3; the Mooloolah River Interchange—a project which has no timeframe and no budget despite early works having started; the Coomera Connector stage 2—again, another project with no timeframe, no budget, no funding; the Cairns Western Arterial Road upgrade, which was revealed by the member for Cairns this week to have been sent back to the drawing board; and the Shute Harbour recreational boating facility. These amendments have added these projects to a legislative schedule which switches off normal planning, heritage and environmental laws.

There will be no development application process, no public notification period, no formal opportunity to lodge objections, no third-party appeal rights, no independent review, no transparency. Communities are asking when they will be consulted and how they will be involved in shaping projects which will not just be there for the Olympics but forever. Under the Crisafulli government, they will not get a say. Queenslanders currently have more formal input into a boundary fence, a backyard shed or a house next door than into multibillion dollar infrastructure projects.

Under this government, transparency is being reframed as 'delay' and community involvement is being labelled as 'red tape'. Just today I spoke in this chamber about the Beerwah station plans of the government which would resume the 90-year-old Beerwah Co-Op, a group the transport minister is refusing to meet with despite over 6½ thousand petitioners. This government in these amendments now says to Beerwah, 'You may as well throw that feedback in the bin,' because this project can be approved without any community consultation. Under these rushed amendments, which have been given half a day's notice and zero scrutiny, those locals will not have a say.

We know the Deputy Premier owns property along the proposed Wave rail line. The Deputy Premier owns property along this proposed rail line right near a proposed new station, so presumably he is fine with these things, but others may not be. Rushing through laws which remove any parliamentary or public scrutiny of a project which materially benefits the Deputy Premier's financial interests: that is what we are talking about today.

Mr STEVENS: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The member for Aspley referred to things before the Ethics Committee and I ask him to withdraw.

Mr MELLISH: If I can assist on that point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Furner): Please do.

Mr MELLISH: These matters are not before the Ethics Committee. That is a related matter but is not what I am talking about today.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will take some advice from the clerks at the table. Member for Aspley, can you give an assurance that this is a matter that is not before the Ethics Committee?

Mr MELLISH: I am very happy to give an assurance that this matter is not before the Ethics Committee in the way in which I am speaking about it.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. Please proceed.

Mr MELLISH: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. This is rushing through laws when the Deputy Premier has stated that he has interests along this rail line. That is not up for debate and will—

Mr LANGBROEK: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

Mr MELLISH: This is a protection racket. This is clearly—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Take your seat please, member for Aspley.

Mr LANGBROEK: Mr Deputy Speaker, I think this is very dangerous territory. The Deputy Premier has clearly expressed a number of times that he has made clear explanations, including to authorities, about his declarations. Trying to smear, as the shadow minister is currently doing, is completely inappropriate when he cannot validate his claim that the Ethics Committee is not investigating all aspects of the Deputy Premier's ownership of his house along this prospective rail line.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have had assurances that it is not before the committee, so I call the member for Aspley to continue.

Mr MELLISH: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. When you are on the LNP backbench and you are trying to get a road approved in your local area or you are trying to get a school hall built and you are pitching to the Premier, the Deputy Premier and the Treasurer, just know that the Deputy Premier is spending his time in this chamber rushing through legislation which benefits his financial interests.

Mr LANGBROEK: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

Mr MELLISH: This rushed-through bill will benefit the Deputy Premier's interests.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Aspley, take your seat. What is your point of order?

Mr LANGBROEK: Mr Deputy Speaker, there are clear imputations that the shadow minister is making, having given an assurance that the issues that he has raised are not before the Ethics Committee. It is clear that you cannot just say anything you like in a debate, having given a verbal assurance that the matter is not before the Ethics Committee, when the Deputy Premier has made numerous declarations about this very matter. You cannot just come in here and say anything you like about anything with a tenuous connection.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I understand that. What is your point of order?

Mr LANGBROEK: That this is not relevant to the long title of the bill.

Mr BAILEY: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The acting Leader of the House, if he has concerns, knows the process. He can write, as is his right, to the Speaker. That is the appropriate process. This is not a place to argue the matter at hand.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Once again, member for Aspley, I will get you to reinforce your assurance that this is not a matter before the Ethics Committee.

Mr MELLISH: Absolutely, Deputy Speaker, in the way that I am talking about this project. The matter before the Ethics Committee, as I understand it, is around whether the Deputy Premier has made a declaration. I am making no accusation that the Deputy Premier has not made a declaration. If I can continue my contribution?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Maybe an explanation of the relevance to the bill before the House would be helpful.

Mr MELLISH: To explain the relevance, the amendments here clearly outline transport infrastructure, including the transport infrastructure project that I am referring to, which will be fast-tracked under the amendments to this bill. That is very clear. There is a media release here from the Deputy Premier today outlining this exact project—the Wave project—and these amendments would allow this project to bypass planning approvals.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Given the standing orders, the Speaker has arrived and I am going to have him replace me.

Mr MELLISH: Thank you, Mr Speaker. If I can continue my contribution? Might I continue my contribution, Speaker?

Mr SPEAKER: Wait until I give you the call. Member, from what I can hear, the contribution you are making at the moment has no relevance to the bill as we have it. You have no evidence—you have nothing to support what you are saying, and I will ask you to come back to the long title of the bill or you will be sat down.

Mr STEVENS: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

Mr MELLISH: I am speaking to the amendments.

Mr SPEAKER: Resume your seat—last warning. Member for Mermaid Beach?

Mr STEVENS: My point of order is as chairman of the Ethics Committee. I am terribly embarrassed about the assurance that the member has given to the Deputy Speaker previously in the chair, because the matters he raised directly impinge upon the considerations of the Ethics Committee and I shall be writing to you.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you very much for that point of order. Member for Aspley, you will talk to the bill or I will be taking serious action—last warning.

Mr MELLISH: I am happy to speak on the bill and the amendments to the bill which will bypass planning approvals, which will bypass heritage approvals, which will bypass parliamentary scrutiny, which will bypass public scrutiny of a range of Olympics-related infrastructure and Olympics-related transport infrastructure. If there is a late amendment to the amendment that removes those from the bill I am happy to no longer speak about those, but I will continue speaking about what these amendments will do to projects which the Deputy Premier has flagged. This is major, generational infrastructure and it deserves more than three hours scrutiny. It deserves more than a cursory glance by this parliament. This should have gone through a proper committee process.